

SPONSOR'S

VIEW

(cont'd):

The Governor should "at least extend the courtesy" of talking with a person whose bill he intends to veto, to give the sponsor a chance to explain the bill, Browder said.

Ticket scalping

(HB 738 by Bryant)

DIGEST:

The bill would have made it a Class B misdemeanor to buy or sell for more than face value an admission ticket to an athletic event sponsored by or participated in by an educational institution. The bill would also have prohibited the unauthorized resale of tickets to athletic and entertainment events not sponsored by an educational institution. Unless authorized by an event's sponsor, resale would be prohibited within 1,000 yards of the event, its ticket offices, and its parking lots. Resale for more than \$3 above the original price would be prohibited under any circumstances. For a first offense, the seller could be fined \$50 to \$200 (Class C misdemeanor). Each subsequent offense would be a Class B misdemeanor.

GOVERNOR'S

REASONS

FOR VETO;

The Governor cited inconsistencies in the bill as the reason for his veto. Specifically, scalping of tickets at college athletic events carried a stiffer fine than scalping at professional athletic or entertainment events. Further, at college-sponsored events both the buyer and seller would be guilty of an offense while only the seller would be guilty at professional events.

SPONSOR'S

VIEW:

As introduced, the bill would have prohibited scalping only at college-sponsored events. The Senate broadened the scope of the bill to include professional events. Rep. Bryant said he never intended the bill to apply to professional entertainment and sports events, but since the bill returned to the House late in the session, he chose to concur with Senate amendments rather than risk killing the bill. He said the Governor received pressure to veto the bill from people who held season tickets to professional football games.

NOTES:

The HSG analysis of this bill appeared in the May 6 Daily Floor Report.

Expanding Houston's civil service system for police and firefighters
(HB 761 by Green)

DIGEST:

HB 761 would have expanded coverage under Houston's civil service system for police officers and firefighters to personnel that perform such law enforcement duties as warrant service, airport policing, and

DIGEST
(cont'd):

parks and recreation policing. The heads of their respective departments would comply with the same requirements placed upon the chief of police. These workers could not participate in the police department's pension or retirement system. If they have been employed as law enforcement personnel for at least six months, no civil service examination would be required.

GOVERNOR'S
REASONS
FOR VETO:

Expanding coverage to certain law enforcement personnel who are employed by the City of Houston but who are not part of the Houston Police Department would be an undue and unnecessary expansion of the civil service system in Houston. It would lessen the effectiveness and efficiency of city government.

SPONSOR'S
VIEW:

Rep. Green said the Governor simply accepted the view of the City of Houston without examining the needs of the law enforcement officers involved. More officers will get fed up with the system. The already high turnover rate will increase as a result of this veto.

Public school employees group insurance
(HB 769 by Atkinson)

DIGEST:

This bill would have established a group insurance program for public school employees working more than half-time. The program would have been administered by the State Board of Education. It also proposed a similar program for school district employees, to be administered by the Teacher Retirement System. Employees would be covered either by a state or local plan. All school district employees would have been eligible for optional coverage. The state would have paid part of the monthly premium for every individual covered.

GOVERNOR'S
REASONS
FOR VETO:

Many employees would prefer salary increases to state funding for group health insurance. This bill would have provided no real benefit to public school employees while increasing the administrative burden on local school districts. Furthermore, it is bad public policy to give the Teacher Retirement System so much power over the day-to-day operation of school districts.